On links of vertices in simplicial d-complexes embeddable in the euclidean $2d$-space*

Salman Parsa†

arXiv:1512.05164v4 [cs.CG] 23 Jun 2016

Abstract

We consider d-dimensional simplicial complexes which can be PL embedded in the $2d$-dimensional euclidean space. In short, we show that in any such complex, for any three vertices, the intersection of the link-complexes of the vertices is linklessly embeddable in the $(2d-1)$-dimensional euclidean space. These considerations lead us to a new upper bound on the total number of d-simplices in an embeddable complex in $2d$-space with n vertices, improving known upper bounds, for all $d \geqslant 2$. Moreover, the bound is also true for the size of d-complexes linklessly embeddable in the $(2d+1)$-dimensional space.

1 Introduction and Overview of Results

There is great interest in understanding properties of simplicial complexes which are embeddable in a certain euclidean space. The basic case is 1-dimensional complexes that are embeddable in the plane, i.e., graphs that can be drawn on the plane without crossings between the edges. Planar graphs are very well understood, for instance, it is easily shown that if a planar graph has n vertices it has at most $3n-6$ edges. However, roughly speaking, how "dense" a simplicial d-complex embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ can be, is less understood for arbitrary d. In this paper we show certain properties of embeddable complexes that, for instance, can be used to give an upper bound for this density problem.

The property we mentioned involves the notion of the link-complex of a vertex and linking of spheres in euclidean spaces (and more generally of algebraic cycles). We begin by considering the simplest (but perhaps the hardest) case $d = 2$. We consider first 2-complexes in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Let K be a 2-complex. The link-complex of a vertex is the maximal 1-subcomplex (a graph) whose join with the vertex is a subcomplex of K (we give definitions in later sections). Sometimes the embeddability property of the complex provides restrictions on possible link-graphs. The following is well-known, see [4]. Assume that the complex K is sitting in $\mathbb{R}^3$, i.e., simplex-wise linearly embedded. Then, if we consider small enough balls around each vertex, we can observe that the intersection of the boundary of a ball with the complex K is a drawing of the link-graph of the vertex on the 2-sphere. Now a planar graph with n vertices has at most $3n-6$ edges, hence the total number of edges in all link-graphs is at most $n(3(n-1)-6) = 3n^2-9n$. Since each triangle is counted three times it follows that such a complex K over n vertices has at most n^2-3n triangles. A complex embedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and $\Omega(n^2)$ triangles can be constructed by putting n vertices on each of two skew lines in 3-space and then taking the Delaunay triangulation of the point set; it will consist of $\Omega(n^2)$ tetrahedra. Alternatively, one can take the boundary of the 4-dimensional cyclic polytope, remove a single facet and embed it in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

*Funded by a post-doctoral fellowship from Fondation Sciences Mathématiques de Paris, and by the French ANR Blanc project ANR-12-BS02-005 (RDAM). Part of this work was done while the author was at IST Austria and funded by the TOPOSYS project FP7-ICT- 318493-STREP.

†École normale supérieure, Paris, France.parsa@di.ens.fr



Figure 1: linking of spheres in various dimensions

If we know that K embeds in $\mathbb{R}^4$, in general no restriction is imposed on the link-graph of a vertex. To see this, take an arbitrary graph in some $\mathbb{R}^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ and "cone" this graph from a vertex on one side of the 3-plane. Hence, arbitrary graphs appear as link-complexes of embeddable 2-complexes. We can add another vertex on the other side of the 3-plane and cone again. Thus the intersection of two link-graphs can be an arbitrary graph. However, there are global restrictions on the set of all link-complexes and the above process cannot be continued. In words, we show that in a PL embeddable 2-complex, for any triple of distinct link-graphs, their common intersection (or a triple intersection) has to be a linklessly embeddable graph. Informally, a linklessly embeddable graph is one that can be "drawn" in space without links between disjoint circles. Figure 1 shows some examples of links in euclidean spaces between spheres of the right dimensions.

An interesting property of our main observation is that the same proof works for all dimensions. That is, we show that for any PL embeddable d-complex, each triple intersection of link-complexes is a linklessly embeddable $(d-1)$-complex (in $\mathbb{R}^{2d-1}$). As an consequence, in a planar graph, triple intersections of link-complexes (subsets of vertices) have at most three vertices. This is because four points on a real-line always allow a link between two 0-dimensional spheres. Obviously, in this case the graph would contain a $K_{3,3}$ otherwise, and hence would be non-planar. Of course this bound is not tight since we know that the triple intersections has at most two points. However, this example shows the application of the results of this article to the case $d = 1$. In the case $d = 2$ a stronger fact is true that a triple intersection of links is actually a planar graph[1]. The proof of planarity in the case $d = 2$ uses the characterization of planar graphs by forbidden minors, and so is not directly generalized into higher dimensions, see the last section for a discussion about planarity.

These observations lead us to derive a new upper bound on the number of top simplices of embeddable d-complexes with n vertices. For a simplicial complex K, let $f_i(K)$ be the number of i-dimensional simplices of K. Denote by $f_d(n)$ the maximum number of d-simplices of an (continuously) embeddable d-complex with n vertices in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$. The problem of determining or bounding $f_d(n)$ is a major open problem. For the case of (boundaries of simplicial) convex polytopes, by the famous Upper Bound Theorem, the f-vector is always bounded above by the f-vector of the cyclic polytope, see [14] and [25]. This result has been strengthened to include all homeomorphic complexes to a convex polytope, see [20]. We note that deriving asymptotic tight bounds for all these cases is much easier by using the vanishing of the Betti numbers and the Euler relation. For instance, in the case $d = 2$, the Euler relation states that $\beta_0(K) - \beta_1(K) + \beta_2(K) = f_0(K) - f_1(K) + f_2(K)$ in a simplicial complex. Hence $f_2(K)$ asymptotically is dominated by $f_1(K) + \beta_2(K)$.

It is conjectured by many that the same (at least) asymptotic bounds that is true for d-simplices in the Upper Bound Theorem is also true for $f_d(n)$, this means $f_d(n) = \Theta(n^d)$. However, the best bound in the literature is $f_d(n) = O(n^{d+1-\frac{1}{d^3}})$, and this is the best known

[1]This improvement was noted to the author by Uli Wagner.

bound for all $d > 1$. This bound is proved by forbidding some non-embeddable subcomplexes, see [7] or [24, 5] for a proof, and also [3] for an application. In this paper, in Theorem 3, we improve this bound to $f_d(n) = O(n^{d+1-\frac{1}{(d-1)^3}})$. We also show that the same bound is true for the number of d-simplices in d-complexes which can be linklessly embedded in $\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$. Note that this latter result is strictly stronger than the former, since a complex that is embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ is linklessly embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$. There exist also bounds on these complexes by forbidding "bad" subcomplexes, see [18, 22] for instances of small non-linklessly embeddable complexes.

It is shown in [24] that a (suitably defined) random d-complex embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ has asymptotically almost surely $f_d(K) < Cf_{d-1}(K)$ for some constant C. So the conjecture is true for almost all complexes. The general belief is that the current upper bounds is far from the truth. However, we think this paper leads to a better understanding of embeddable complexes.

organization of the paper We presented an overview of the results in Section 1 above. In Section 2, we bring the necessary background material and definitions. This section serves mostly to set up our notation and recalls some definitions. In Section 3 we state our main theorems formally and prove them. We first prove the main observation, Lemma 1, and then in 3.2 we derive the bounds on the number of simplices. The argument makes use of a combinatorial lemma which is proved in Section 3.3.

2 Basic Concepts

In this section we recall definitions and briefly review some preliminary facts used later in the paper. By a simplicial complex K we mean an abstract complex, i.e., a set system over a finite set of *vertices* satisfying the usual condition that all the subsets of an element of K are also in K. If $\sigma \in K$, its *realization* $|\sigma|$, is a simplex in an euclidean space spanning $\#\sigma$ points in general position. The dimension of σ is the dimension of its realization, i.e., $\#\sigma - 1$. Dimension of K is the largest dimension of its simplices. A realization of K in a euclidean space is defined as follows. Assign n points of the space to vertices such that all the simplices of K are simultaneously realized, and moreover, the realizations of disjoint simplices are disjoint. The subset of the euclidean space which is the union of realizations of simplices is a *realization* of K in the euclidean space. In fact a realization always exists, and, with the induced topology from the euclidean spaces these realizations are homeomorphic. Hence there is topological space defined for K which is called the *underlying space* of K and denoted by $|K|$. We write $V(K) = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ for the set of vertices and sometimes just integers from 1 to n. The k-skeleton of K is denoted K_k.

stars and links The *star* of a simplex $\sigma \in K$ is the set $st(\sigma) = \{\tau \in K, \sigma \subset \tau\}$. The *closed star* of σ, $St(\sigma)$, is the smallest subcomplex of K containing $st(\sigma)$. The complex $St(x) - st(x)$ is called the *link-complex* of σ and denoted $L(\sigma)$. The closed star is the join of $L(\sigma)$ with σ.

We work with stars and link-complexes of vertices only. The stars of vertices cover K such that each k-simplex, $k > 0$, is covered $(k + 1)$-times. Also, any k-simplex appears in as many link-complexes (of vertices), as the number of its incident $(k + 1)$-simplices, or its *degree*. It follows that the link-complexes of vertices cover all simplices of degree more than 1.

Let $f_k = f_k(K)$ denote the number of k-simplices of K. A k-simplex $\sigma \in K$ is determined by giving one of its vertices v and the $(k - 1)$-simplex of $L(v)$ whose join with v is σ. Each

k-simplex is determined in $k+1$ different ways. Therefore, in general, the numbers f_k satisfy

$$(k+1)f_k = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \#L(v_i)_{k-1}. \tag{1}$$

notions of embeddings There exist various notions of embedding into euclidean spaces. A continuous injective map is the most general notion. And the narrowest concept for our purposes is the *simplex-wise linear* embedding. This is the same as realizing the complex in the required euclidean space. A *piece-wise linear* (PL) embedding is one that is a simplex-wise linear embedding after finitely many (barycentric) subdivisions. Since a closed simplex is compact, a continuous map can be approximated by a PL map such that the images of two (vertex) disjoint simplices are disjoint. Such a PL map is called an *almost embedding*. It seems that the linklessness condition of Theorem 1 cannot easily be extended to almost embeddings instead of PL embeddings.

We also say a simplicial complex is *d-planar* if it embeds in the euclidean d-space, if $d = 2$ we simply say *planar*.

embeddings of link-complexes Let K be a d-complex with a PL map $\iota : |K| \to \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. Put a ball of small radius $\epsilon > 0$ around the vertex v_i, called $B(i) = B(v_i)$ and denote by $S(i) = S(v_i)$ its boundary $(2d-1)$-sphere. If we choose ϵ small enough then $S(i) \cap \iota(|K|)$ defines an (linear) embedding of the link-complex of v_i into the sphere $S(i)$ and hence into $\mathbb{R}^{2d-1}$. All the embeddings that are achieved in this way on spheres of different (small) radii are isotopic to each other. We refer to such an embedding when we say *the embedding of the link-complex of* v_i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

chains in spaces We will need familiarity with the very basic notions of chain complexes. In this paragraph we merely fix notation and refer to [8, 15, 17] or any textbook of algebraic topology for complete definitions.

A singular k-dimensional simplex in a space K is a map $\sigma : |\Delta^k| \to X$, where Δ^k is a standard oriented k-simplex. The k-th singular chain group of X, $C_k(X)$ is a free abelian group generated by all singular simplices, where $-\sigma$ is σ with the oppositely oriented domain simplex. The elements $c \in C_k(X)$ are called singular k-chains and they can be written as finite formal sums $c = \sum_i n_i\sigma_i$ where n_i are integers and σ_i are singular simplices. When X is a simplicial complex one can in the above definition replace singular simplices by obvious linear maps of a standard oriented simplex onto a target simplex. The resulting chains are called simplicial chains. Hence a simplicial chain is formal summation of oriented simplices.

There exists a homomorphism $\partial_k : C_k(X) \to C_{k-1}(X)$ called the *boundary homomorphism*. We refer to basic algebraic topology textbooks for the definitions. Intuitively, in the case of simplicial chains, ∂ assigns to each generator the sum of its boundary lower dimensional simplices. The orientations are such that each boundary simplex gets its natural orientation from the orientation of the simplex. In the singular case, the boundary simplices are replaced by restrictions of the singular simplex to the boundary simplices. A chain is said to bound if there exist a higher dimensional chain that maps to it by ∂. A chain is a cycle if its boundary is zero. We denote the group of i-cycles by $Z_i(X)$. We say two chain c_1 and c_2 are *disjoint* if their images are disjoint. A map f between spaces induces homomorphisms on chain complexes which we denote by $f_\sharp$.

intersection homomorphism and linking numbers We make use of some elementary facts about intersection and linking numbers of chains in a euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$ which we bring

in this section. For proofs of these properties we refer to [17, 11].

In $\mathbb{R}^d$, for some integer $d > 0$, the *intersection number* of two singular chains $c_p \in C_p(\mathbb{R}^d), c_{d-p} \in C_{d-p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is an integer defined whenever ∂c_p is disjoint from c_{d-p}, and ∂c_{d-p} is disjoint from c_p, and moreover, the maps are "nice", see [17]. It is enough for our purposes to restrict to pairs of singular chains that interest finitely many times and transversely at each point. Intuitively, the intersection number, $\mathcal{I}(c_p, c_{d-p})$, counts the number of transverse intersections with proper signs. The general way of finding the intersection number of two singular chains is by approximating them by dual chains in a sufficiently fine triangulation and then counting the intersection by proper signs, which is the product of three orientations, two of the local orientations of intersecting chains and that of the space.

The intersection number is bilinear as long as the terms on both sides are defined,

$$\mathcal{I}(c_p + c'_p, c_{d-p}) = \mathcal{I}(c_p, c_{d-p}) + \mathcal{I}(c'_p, c_{d-p}).$$

Thus the intersection number defines a homomorphism $Z_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \times Z_{d-p}(\mathbb{R}^d) \to \mathbb{Z}$. It also passes to homology groups, that is if $c_p - c'_p = \partial d$ for a chain d then $\mathcal{I}(c_p, c_{d-p}) = \mathcal{I}(c'_p, c_{d-p})$ whenever both terms are defined. We will not need this fact though. The crucial fact we use is that in $\mathbb{R}^d$ any two cycles of complementary dimensions (> 0) have intersection number 0. Both of these claims above follow from the following general fact about the intersection numbers, which again is true when the terms are defined, that is, when ∂c_p and ∂c_{d-p+1} are disjoint,

$$\mathcal{I}(c_p, \partial c_{d-p+1}) = (-1)^p \mathcal{I}(\partial c_p, c_{d-p+1}). \tag{2}$$

It is also true that two disjoint chains have intersection number 0. We next define the linking number of two (null-homologous) disjoint cycles z_p, z_{d-p-1} in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let c be such that $\partial c = z_p$, then

$$\mathcal{L}(z_p, z_{d-p-1}) = \mathcal{I}(c, z_{d-p-1})$$

is the *linking number* of z_p and z_{n-p-1}. It follows from Formula 2 that the linking number is independent of the choice of c and hence is well-defined. We also note that the linking number in general changes within a homology class.

linklessly embeddable complexes Let L be a simplicial d-complex and $\iota : |L| \to \mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$ be an embedding, and denote by $\iota_\sharp$ the induced map on chain groups. We call the embedding $\iota : |L| \to \mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$ *linkless*[2], if for any two disjoint simplicial d-cycles $c_1, c_2 \in C_d(L)$ their images $\iota_\sharp(c_1), \iota_\sharp(c_2)$ have linking number zero. A simplicial d-complex is *linklessly embeddable* if there exists a linkless embebdding of it into $\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$. We remark that there exist other definitions of linklessness of embeddings, but this definition is suitable for our application.

linklessly embeddable graphs The Conway-Gordon-Sachs theorem states that the graph K_6 is not linklessly embeddable into $\mathbb{R}^3$. It follows that any graph which has a subdivision of K_6 as a subgraph is also not linklessly embeddable. It is an old and basic result in extremal graph theory, proved by Mader [12], that a graph without a subdivision of K_6 as a subgraph satisfies $m \leqslant 4n$, where n is the number of vertices and m is the number of edges. This bound is tight and a graph with $4n + O(1)$ edges is just an apex graph, which is a planar graph together with a new vertex connected to every other vertex. On the other hand, there exists the Robertson-Saymour-Thomas characterization of linklessly embeddable graphs by forbidding the so called Petersen family of graphs as minors, [16]. Since K_6 is one of them, the set of linklessly

[2]The name "linking" in this sense is related to the name "link-complex" since in a manifold the link-complex is a sphere linked with the original simplex.

emebeddable graphs is contained in the set of K_6-minor-free graphs, and bounds for sizes of arbitrary K_t-minor-free graphs are also known, [21]. Moreover, tight bounds on sizes of graphs that do not have a K_t as topological subgraph are also known, [1, 10].

3 links in link-complexes

In this section we prove our main theorem on the possible link-complexes of vertices of a d-complex realized in $2d$-space. This theorem gives an obstruction for embeddebility of complexes in euclidean spaces based on the complexity of the intersections of link-complexes of vertices.

Let $c \in C(K)$ be a simplicial chain. Whenever c is defined in a link-complex $L(v)$ (i.e., $|c| \subset |L(v)| \subset |K|$) then we have a singular chain $\iota_{v\sharp}(c)$, which is an embedding of the carrier of c into $S(v)$. Recall that for every vertex v, $S(v)$ is a $(2d-1)$-sphere around v, which bounds a ball $B(v)$ centered at v. We assume the balls are so small that image of ι inside the ball $B(v)$ (and in a slightly larger ball) is linear and consists of a single connected component.

Lemma 1. *Let $\iota : |K| \to \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ be a PL embedding of the d-complex K. Let $c_1, c_2 \in Z_{d-1}(K)$ be disjoint simplicial cycles. Give the spheres $S(v_i)$ orientations induced from $\mathbb{R}^4$. Assume there is a vertex v such that $\mathcal{L}(\iota_v(c_1), \iota_v(c_2)) = \lambda \neq 0$ in $S(v)$, then $\mathcal{L}(\iota_w(c_1), \iota_w(c_2)) = \pm\lambda$ in $S(w)$, for any vertex $w \neq v$ for which $\iota_w(c_1)$ and $\iota_w(c_2)$ are defined. Moreover, if one such w exists then none of the chains c_1, c_2 can appear in a third link-complex.*

Proof. We refer to Figure 2 for a schematic overview of the notation. Let $c_i^u = \iota_{u\sharp}(c_i)$, for a vertex u and $i = 1, 2$. By assumption, the linking number $\mathcal{L}(c_1^v, c_2^v)$ is defined and is not zero in $S(v)$.

Let $d_1^v, d_2^v \in C(S(v))$ be such that $\partial d_1^v = c_1^v, \partial d_2^v = c_2^v$. Then by definition we have

$$\lambda = \mathcal{L}(c_1^v, c_2^v) = \mathcal{I}(c_1^v, d_2^v).$$

Here and in the following the ambient space in which a linking or an intersection number is computed is clear from the arguments of $\mathcal{L}(,)$ and $\mathcal{I}(,)$.

Assume $c_1 = \sum_{i=1}^m n_i\sigma_i$, were the σ_i are oriented simplices and the n_i are non-zero integers. If the oriented d-simplex σ is defined by $v_0 \dots v_d$ then define $v\sigma$ to be the oriented $(d+1)$-simplex $vv_0v_1 \dots v_d$, i.e., the cone over σ oriented as indicated. Let $h_1^v \in C(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ be the chain $\iota_\sharp(vc_1)$, where $vc_1 = \sum_{i=1}^m n_i v\sigma_i$. Let h_2^v be the same for c_2. One easily computes that $\partial(vc_1) = \pm c_1$. The sign is not changed if the convention is that the oriented boundary simplex $p_{d-1} \dots p_0$ is considered positively oriented with respect to the oriented simplex $p_d p_{d-1} \dots p_0$, we assume it is the case. It then follows that $\partial h_1^v = \iota_\sharp(c_1)$.

Consider the chain $d_2'^v = \iota_\sharp(v(\iota^{-1})_\sharp(c_2^v))$. This is part of the image of the cone $|vc_2|$ bounded by c_2^v and containing image of v, hence it lies in $B(v)$. Define $h_2'^v = h_2^v - d_2'^v + d_2^v$. We claim that the intersection numbers satisfy

$$\mathcal{I}(h_1^v, h_2'^v) = \pm\mathcal{I}(c_1^v, d_2^v). \tag{3}$$

Assume there exists a vertex w with $\iota_w : |L(w)| \to S(w)$. Assuming (3) we argue as follows that $\mathcal{L}(c_1^w, c_2^w) = \pm\lambda$ in $S(w)$. Note that this latter condition implies that c_1^w and c_2^w are defined.

To see this claim, we write

$$\mathcal{I}(h_1^w - h_1^v, h_2'^w - h_2'^v) = \mathcal{I}(h_1^w, h_2'^w) - \mathcal{I}(h_1^w, h_2'^v) - \mathcal{I}(h_1^v, h_2'^w) + \mathcal{I}(h_1^v, h_2'^v). \tag{4}$$

The two middle terms of the right-hand side are zero as follows. We have

$$\mathcal{I}(h_1^w, h_2'^v) = \mathcal{I}(h_1^w, h_2^v) + \mathcal{I}(h_1^w, -d_2'^v + d_2^v).$$



Figure 2: guide to the notation

The underlying space of the chains h_1^w and h_2^v are disjoint and hence these two chains have intersection number zero. The second term is also zero since the cycle $d_2^v - d_2'^v$ is inside the ball bounded by $S(v)$ and is disjoint from h_1^w by the choice of the spheres. The third term of the right-hand side of (4) can similarly be shown to be zero.

Since the two cycles $h_1^w - h_1^v$ and $h_2'^w - h_2'^v$ must have intersection number 0, it follows that $\mathcal{I}(h_1^w, h_2'^w) = -\mathcal{I}(h_1^v, h_2'^v)$. And from (3) it must be that $\mathcal{I}(h_1^w, h_2'^w) = \pm\mathcal{I}(c_1^w, d_2^w) = \pm\mathcal{L}(c_1^w, c_2^w)$, and similarly, $\mathcal{I}(h_1^v, h_2'^v) = \mathcal{L}(c_1^v, c_2^v)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{L}(c_1^w, c_2^w) = \pm\lambda$.

It remains to show (3). Let $|c|$ denote the image of the chain c, or its carrier. Since the map ι restricted to $\iota^{-1}(\hat{B}(v))$ is linear, where $\hat{B}(v)$ is a ball slightly larger than $B(v)$, any transverse intersection between $|c_1^v|$ and $|d_2^v|$ gives rise to a transverse intersection between $|h_1^v|$ and $|d_2^v| \subset |h_2'^v|$. The rest of $|h_2'^v|$ is disjoint from $|h_1^v|$. Hence, the set of intersection points of h_1^v and $h_2'^v$ is the same as the set of intersection points of c_1^v and d_2^v in $S(v)$. We thus only need to argue that the intersections have the same signs in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ as in $S(v)$. The sign of an intersection depends on three orientations, the two of the intersecting chains around the intersection point and the orientation of the ambient space. The chains d_2^v and $h_2'^v$ have the same orientations around intersection points. The orientations of the $S(v_i)$ are induced by that of $\mathbb{R}^4$ and hence are fixed. It remains to show that the orientations of c_1^v and h_1^v around any intersection point does not depend on the specific point. We thus only must show that the orientations of the simplices of h_1^v are determined naturally around the intersection points. But this is the case since the orientations of the simplices of h_1^v inside the ball are defined from those of c_1^v by the natural coning process sending $\iota_v(\sigma_i)$ to $\iota(v)\iota_v(\sigma_i)$.

Next we prove the last part of the lemma. From the above it follows that the 2-cycle $s_1 = h_1^v - h_1^w$ has linking number λ with c_2^v. Since $c_2^v - \iota_\sharp(c_2)$ bounds a chain which is disjoint from s_1, it follows that $\mathcal{L}(s_1, \iota_\sharp(c_2)) = \lambda$. If a third vertex u exists such that c_2 is in its link-complex, then $\iota(uc_2)$ would be a chain disjoint from s_1 and bounding c_2. This contradicts the fact that $\lambda \neq 0$. Symmetrically the argument works for c_1 as well. □

The following is an immediate corollary.

Theorem 1. *Let $\iota : |K| \to \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ be a PL embedding of the d-complex K. If L is a triple intersection of link-complexes of K, then $\iota_v : |L| \to S(v)$ embeds L linklessly, for any v that contains L in its link-complex.*

Remark We have presented our main lemma above in a setting that provides more information that is needed for Theorem 1. The reader will realize that, for instance, for chains with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ coefficients and $\mathbb{Z}_2$ intersection numbers, the proof simplifies.

3.1 planarity for $d = 2$

Theorem 2. *Let K be a 2-complex embedded in $\mathbb{R}^4$. Let L be a 1-subcomplex that is the intersection of three link subcomplexes of K. Then, L is a planar graph.*

This theorem can be derived easily from the following fact first proved by Grünbaum [6], see also [23, 13]. Let $K^{d_1}_{2d_1+3}, K^{d_2}_{2d_2+3}, \ldots, K^{d_p}_{2d_p+3}$ be p complexes such that $K^{d_i}_{2d_i+3}$ is the complete d_i-complex on $2d_i + 3$ vertices, and, $d = d_1 + d_2 + \ldots + d_p + p - 1$. Then

$$K' = K^{d_1}_{2d_1+3} * K^{d_2}_{2d_2+3} * \cdots * K^{d_p}_{2d_p+3}$$

is a d-complex not embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$. The complex K' is also minimal in the sense that removing a single d-simplex makes it embeddable. In order to show L planar we must show that as a topological graph it cannot contain a topological $K_{3,3}$ or K_5. We have,

$$K_{3,3} = [3] * [3], K_5 = K^1_{2\times 1+3}$$

where $[3]$ is a complex consisting of three disjoint vertices. Thus if L contains a homeomorphic copy of a $K_{3,3}$ or K_5 then K will contain a subcomplex homeomorphic to $[3]*[3]*[3]$ or $K^1_5 * [3]$. However, by the result mentioned above these complexes are not embeddable and the theorem is proved.

3.2 bounding the number of top simplices in d-complexes in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$

In this section we use the theorems which restrict the triple intersections of links of vertices to derive an upper bound on the number of top simplices in a d-complex embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$.

We consider first the 2-complexes. For the purpose of bounding the number of triangles, we use the fact that triple intersections of link complexes are planar. It is well-known that a planar graph on n vertices has at most $f(n) = 3n - 6$ edges. Thus, for any embedded 2-complex K in $\mathbb{R}^4$, any triple intersection of links of vertices has at most $f(n) = 3n - 6$ edges. From Formula 1 and a basic combinatorial lemma proved in the next section, Lemma 2, it follows that the total number of triangles satisfies $f_2 = O(n^{8/3})$.

A similar result with slightly worse constant and for PL embeddings can be obtained using Theorem 1. This is because the graph K_6 is not linklessly embeddable by the well known Conway-Gordon-Sachs theorem. Hence, any linklessly embeddable graph cannot contain a subdivision of K_6 and by the extremal results of Mader [12] it has at most $4n + O(1)$ edges.

Next we consider d-complexes K in $2d$-space, $d \geqslant 3$. From the non-embeddebility result of Grünbaum it follows that a triple intersection of three link-complexes cannot include a complex $F = K^1_5 * [3]$. This is because non-embeddability of $K^1_5 * [3] * [3]$ (into $\mathbb{R}^6$) can be "read from the right" to imply that: In an embeddable complex, any triple intersection of link-complexes of vertices is such that any triple intersection of link-complexes of it do not include a homeomorphic image of K^1_5 as a subgraph. Thus, by the above discussion, any triple intersection of links is a 2-complex of size $O(n^{8/3})$. By Lemma 2 the total number of d-simplices is $O(nn^2n^{8/9}) = O(n^{3+8/9})$. Therefore we can state the following.

Theorem 3. *Let $f_d(n)$ be the maximum number of d simplices of an n-vertex d-complex embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, $d > 0$. Then*

$$f_d(n) = O(n^{d+1-\frac{1}{3^{(d-1)}}}). \tag{5}$$

Proof. For the case $d = 1$ the above reduces to $f_1(n) = O(n)$ hence the classical bound on the number of edges of a planar graph. So we assume that $d > 1$. Let $\phi_d(n)$ be the maximum number of d-simplices in an n-vertex d-complex that does not have a subcomplex homeomorphic to $K_5 * [3] * \cdots * [3]$ with $d-1$ factors of $[3]$. By the results of Grünbaum $f_d(n) \leqslant \phi_d(n)$ and we bound $\phi_d(n)$. For $d = 2$, the condition that complex does not contain a homeomorphic copy of $K_5 * [3]$ implies that triple intersections of link-graphs are graphs that do not contain a subdivision of K_5. By the early results of Mader [12] such graphs have $O(n)$ edges. Then, from Lemma 2 it follows that $\phi_2(n) = O(n^{8/3})$.

Now consider the case of general d. The condition that a d-complex does not have a subcomplex homeomorphic to $K_5 * [3] * \cdots * [3]$ with $d-1$ factors of $[3]$ implies triple intersections of link complexes do not contain subcomplexes homeomorphic to $K_5 * [3] * \cdots * [3]$ with $d-2$ factors of $[3]$. Hence, triple intersections of link complexes are $(d-1)$-complexes over at most $n-1$ vertices whose number of $(d-1)$-simplices is bounded by $\phi_{d-1}(n)$. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 2 again and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_d(n) \leqslant cnn^{\frac{2d}{3}}\phi_{d-1}^{\frac{1}{3}}(n) &\leqslant cc'nn^{\frac{2d}{3}}n^{\frac{1}{3}(d-\frac{1}{3^{d-2}})} \\ &= cc'n^{d+1-\frac{1}{3^{d-1}}}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

In the above c is a constant coming from the combinatorial lemma and c' is the constant in the asymptotic bound for $\phi_{d-1}(n)$, so in general the constant in the notation depends on d. The last equality follows by simple calculation.

□

size of linklessly embeddable d-complexes in $\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$ Using the linklessness criterion of Theorem 1 one can prove in a way totally similar to the proof of Theorem 3 a stronger result than Theorem 3 for continuous embeddings. As noted in the remark above, by [18] Lemma 1, if a d-complex embeds linklessly in $\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$ then it cannot contain a subcomplex homeomorphic to $[3] * \cdots * [3]$, $d+1$ factors. Using an inductive argument as in the proof of Theorem 3, it follows that the same asymptotic bound proved above also applies to complexes that are linklessly embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$, with slightly different constants. In the argument, K_5 is replaced by $[3] * [3]$. Hence, for the case $d = 2$ one needs to bound the number of edges in graphs with no $K_{3,3}$ subdivision and for this purpose it is enough to consider graphs with no subdivision of K_6 as subgraph.

Note that here for $d > 1$ the codimension is at least three and a continuous embedding can always be approximated by a PL one [2].

Theorem 4. *Let $g_d(n)$ be the maximum number of d-simplices of an n-vertex d-complex linklessly embeddable in $\mathbb{R}^{2d+1}$, $d > 0$. Then*

$$g_d(n) = O(n^{d+1-\frac{1}{3^{(d-1)}}}). \tag{7}$$

Remark From the tightness of Lemma 2 it follows that the above bounds are also tight for the conditions we imposed on the link-complexes only. For instance in the case $d = 2$, it is enough to observe that from the set systems given by Lemma 2 one can build a simplicial complex

whose link-complexes correspond to the sets S_i. Let f_0 be the number of vertices. Take the set from the lemma with $m = f_0, n = f_0^2, f = f_0$. Then, simply take a graph over $2f_0$ vertices, so that the elements of the set X can be identified with edges. Then one introduces a vertex for each set S_i and cones over the corresponding set of edges. The resulting complex has the required properties, i.e, the triple intersections of link-complexes have at most f_0 edges and in total the complex contains $\Theta(f_0^{8/3})$ triangles.

3.3 A Combinatorial Lemma

This section gives the proof of a combinatorial lemma used in deriving the upper bounds. We produce it here for completeness. In this section we denote the number of elements of a set S by $|S|$. Let $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ be a finite set and $S = \{S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_m\}$ a collection of subsets of X. We are interested in bounding the quantity $t(S) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} |S_i|$ that is a function of n and m. The restriction on sets S_i comes from their common intersections. Assume that each triple of distinct sets S_i, S_j, S_k satisfies

$$|S_i \cap S_j \cap S_K| \leqslant f(n)$$

where $f(n)$ is a function of the total number of elements n.

Lemma 2. *Under the above conditions* $t(S) = O(mn^{\frac{2}{3}} f(n)^{\frac{1}{3}})$.

Proof. Let κ_i be the number of sets that the element x_i belongs to. To prove the lemma, we bound the quantity $\sum_{\{i,j,k\}} |S_i \cap S_j \cap S_k|$ in two ways. First, since there are $\binom{m}{3}$ summands with each having at most $f(n)$ elements we have

$$\sum_{\{i,j,k\}} |S_i \cap S_j \cap S_k| \leqslant \binom{m}{3} f(n).$$

Let the variable $Y_{lijk} = 1$ when x_l is in $S_i \cap S_j \cap S_k$, $i < j < k$, and zero otherwise. Then, $\sum_{\{i,j,k\}} |S_i \cap S_j \cap S_k| = \sum_{l,i,j,k} Y_{lijk} = \sum_l \sum_{i<j<k} Y_{lijk}$. On the other hand, $\sum_{i<j<k} Y_{lijk}$ is the number of triples $(i, j, k), i < j < k$, such that x_l appears in $S_i \cap S_j \cap S_k$. This number is $\binom{\kappa_l}{3}$. Then we have

$$\sum_l \binom{\kappa_l}{3} = \sum_{\{i,j,k\}} |S_i \cap S_j \cap S_k|. \tag{8}$$

By the Hoelder inequality

$$\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + \ldots + \kappa_n \leqslant (\kappa_1^3 + \kappa_2^3 + \ldots + \kappa_n^3)^{\frac{1}{3}} n^{\frac{2}{3}}.$$

Writing $\kappa = (\sum \kappa_l)/n$, the above becomes $n\kappa^3 \leqslant \kappa_1^3 + \ldots + \kappa_n^3$.
We expand the left hand side of (8):

$$\sum_l \binom{\kappa_l}{3} = \frac{1}{3!}(\sum_l \kappa_l^3 - 3\sum_l \kappa_l^2 + 2\sum_l \kappa_l).$$

From above it follows that

$$\sum_l \binom{\kappa_l}{3} \geqslant \frac{1}{3!} n\kappa^3. \tag{9}$$

Therefore,

$$\kappa^3 = O(m^3 n^{-1} f(n))$$

and since $n\kappa = t(S)$ we obtain

$$t(S) = O(mn^{\frac{2}{3}} f(n)^{\frac{1}{3}}).$$

□

We consider now set systems that can achieve the bounds of the lemma with parameters that are of interest to us, i.e., $n = f_0^2, m = f_0, f = f_0$. Assume $S_1, \ldots, S_m$ is such a system and for any distinct triple, $S_i \cap S_j \cap S_k$ has exactly f elements. Then, we can form another dual system as follows. Let $Y = \{S_1, \ldots, S_m\}$ and define T_i to be those sets S_j that contain the element x_i for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. The the sets T_i satisfy the following condition. Each 3-set of elements of Y appears in exactly f sets T_i. This defines a Steiner system $S_f(3, K; m)$, where K is the set containing sizes of sets T_i and with n sets.

Refer to [9] for extensive account of these and other combinatorial designs. Let t be a positive integer. By definition, a Steiner system $S_\lambda(t, K; v)$ is a set system $(A, \{B_1, \ldots, B_b\})$ over a set $A = \{a_1, \ldots, a_v\}$ such that, each set (or block) has size from K. Moreover, every t-subset of A appears in exactly λ blocks.

It is clear from the above that any $S_f(3, K; m)$ with n blocks can be used to build m sets of an n element set such that each triple of them has exactly f elements. Also, "approximate" Steiner systems are enough for our purposes, however, we are not aware of existence of Steiner systems $S_\lambda(3, K; m)$ with roughly f_0^2 blocks such that m and λ are also approximately f_0.

4 Discussion

We have shown certain restrictions on intersections of link-complexes of vertices in embeddable simplicial complexes. There is an obvious direction to continue this research and that is to find more restrictions of the type introduced here. For instance, what "global" conditions are imposed on double intersections of link-complexes?

It is also natural to strengthen the linklessness criterion to $(2d-2)$-planarity in our main observation for all $d > 1$. It can be done in addition to the case $d = 2$ shown above, in dimensions $2d - 2$, where the embeddability is characterized by the van Kampen obstruction, i.e., when $2d - 2 \neq 4$. One shows that if a complex has van Kampen obstruction nonzero, then its join by three vertices also has nonzero van Kampen obstruction. Hence, non-embeddable complexes in euclidean space of dimension $2d - 2 \neq 4$ cannot be triple intersections of link-complexes of embeddable d-complexes in $2d$-space. However, we are more interested to know if a proof exists that works for all dimensions and hence does not use the characterization of embeddable d-complexes in $2d$-space, by forbidden minors or the van Kampen class.

Acknowledgements The author is indebted to Herbert Edelsbrunner for bringing the Lemma 2 to his notice. The author also thanks Tamal Dey and Uli Wagner for helpful discussions about the problem of this paper.

References

[1] B. Bollobás and A. Thomason. Proof of a conjecture of Mader, Erdős and Hajnal on topological complete subgraphs. *European J. of Combin.*, 19(8):883–887, 1998.

[2] J. L. Bryant. Approximating embeddings of polyhedra in codimension three. *Trans. of the Amer. Math. Soc.*, 170:85–95, 1972.

[3] T. K. Dey. On counting triangulations in d-dimensions. *Comput. Geom.*, 3(6):315 – 325, 1993.

[4] T.K. Dey and H. Edelsbrunner. Counting triangle crossings and halving planes. *Discrete Comput. Geom*, 12(3):281–289, 1994.

[5] P. Erdős. On extremal problems of graphs and generalized graphs. *Israel J. of Math.*, 2(3):183–190, 1964.

[6] B. Grünbaum. Imbeddings of simplicial complexes. *Comm. Math. Helv.*, 44(1):502–513, 1969.

[7] A. Gundert. On the complexity of embeddable simplicial complexes. Diplomarbeit, Freie Universität Berlin, 2009.

[8] A. Hatcher. *Algebraic Topology*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

[9] Beth, T. and Jungnickel, D. and Lenz, H. *Design Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.

[10] J. Komlós and E. Szemerédi. Topological cliques in graphs II. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 5:79–90, 3 1996.

[11] S. Lefschetz. *Topology (AMS Chelsea Publishing)*. American Mathematical Society, 1956.

[12] W. Mader. Homomorphiesätze für Graphen. *Math. Ann.*, 178(2):154–168, 1968.

[13] J. Matousek. *Using the Borsuk-Ulam Theorem: Lectures on Topological Methods in Combinatorics and Geometry*. Springer, 2003.

[14] P. McMullen. The maximum numbers of faces of a convex polytope. *Mathematika*, 17:179–184, 12 1970.

[15] J.R. Munkres. *Elements of Algebraic Topology*. Advanced book classics. Perseus Books Group, 1984.

[16] N. Robertson, P. Seymour, and R. Thomas. Sachs' linkless embedding conjecture. *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B*, 64(2):185 – 227, 1995.

[17] H. Seifert and W. Threlfall. *Lehrbuch der Topologie*. American Mathematical Society, 1934-2004.

[18] M. Skopenkov. Embedding products of graphs into euclidean spaces. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 179(3):191–198, 2003.

[19] V. T. Sós, P Erdős, and W. G. Brown. On the existence of triangulated spheres in 3-graphs, and related problems. *Periodica Mathematica Hungarica*, 3(3-4):221–228, 1973.

[20] R. Stanley. *Combinatorics and Commutative Algebra (Progress in Mathematics)*. Birkhäuser, 1996.

[21] A. Thomason. The extremal function for complete minors. *J. of Combin. Theory, Ser. B*, 81(2):318 – 338, 2001.

[22] C. Tuffley. Some Ramsey-type results on intrinsic linking of n-complexes. *Alg. & Geom. Topology*, 13(3):1579–1612, 2013.

[23] B R. Ummel. Imbedding classes and n-minimal complexes. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 38(1):201–206, 1973.

[24] U. Wagner. Minors in random and expanding hypergraphs. In *Proc. of the Twenty-seventh Ann. Symp, Comput. Geom.*, pp 351–360, New York, NY, USA, 2011.

[25] G M. Ziegler. *Lectures on Polytopes.* Springer, 2012.